DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 286 JC 770 126

TITLE	Report of the Task Force to Implement Senate Bill 1346 on Funding Support for Community College Education in Michigan and Their Mission and Roles and State-Local Relations.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, Lansing.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	86p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; Community Colleges; Coordination; Decentralization; Decision Making; *Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Equalization Aid; Financial Problems; Governance; Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; Models; Noncredit Courses; Participation; *Policy Formation; Resource Allocations; School District Autonomy; *State Aid; *State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; Tax Support; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	*Michigan

ABSTRACT

This document presents the final recommendations and background papers of a task force empowered by the Michigan legislature to consider the mission and roles of the state community colleges, alternative funding modes, and the responsibilities and interrelationships of the state and local governing boards. Following an overview of recommendations and summaries of the reports of subcommittees in the three areas, the bulk of the document consists of a detailed explication of the recommended funding model and the report of the subcommittee on state-local relations, presented in appendices. The funding model is based on a 50/50 division of responsibility between the state and local districts, including that for leisure-time courses, and is a criterion-based model intended to equalize local tax bases and economies of scale. The model is presented in two sections: "The Determination of Gross General Fund Investment Needs" and "A Method for the Allocation of State Funds Based on the Determination Needs Model." Measurement criteria, methodology, formulae, and sample applications of the model are provided. The state and local relations committee report presents an historical perspective, a discussion of areas of concern identified through a survey of community college presidents, an analysis of involvement patterns in the state policy decision-making process, outlines the state/local division of governance responsibility, weighs the advantages and disadvantages of centralized versus autonomous systems of governance, and concludes that the state should remain sensitive to the need for institutional autonomy and that a more democratic, less bureaucratic system of statewide governance is needed. The survey instrument and definitions of terms are included. (BB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED134286

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE TO IMPLEMENT SENATE BILL 1346

ON FUNDING SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN AND THEIR MISSION AND ROLES AND STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

HE 7.710 1346

STATE BOARD FOR PUBLIC
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

JANUARY, 1977

2

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Barbara Dumouchelle ..... Grosse Ile
Dr. Paul B. Henry ..... Grand Rapids
Barbara Roberts Mason ..... Lansing
Annetta Miller ..... Huntington Woods
Dr. Gumecindo Salas ..... East Lansing
Norman Otto Stockmeyer, Sr. ..... Westland
Edmund F. Vandette ..... Houghton
John Watanen, Jr. ..... Marquette

Ex-Officio Members

William G. Milliken
Governor

Dr. John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSION AND ROLES

III. FUNDING SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

IV. STATE AND LOCAL BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES

APPENDICES

A. SECTION 16, ACT NO. 244 of the Public Acts of 1976

B. SCHEDULE OF TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

C. COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDING MODEL

D. STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

E. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

F. SURVEY ON GOVERNANCE

G. MEMBERSHIP OF THE TASK FORCE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of the major recommendations contained in the final reports of the three committees of the Task Force.

Mission and Roles

A community college shall serve as a postsecondary educational institution providing, primarily for all those persons who are beyond the age of compulsory attendance and primarily for those within commuting distance programs and services which may result in the granting of diplomas or certificates but not including high school diplomas or baccalaureate or graduate degrees.

Such programs, courses and services shall reflect the needs of those persons residing in the college service area, including, but not limited to, guidance and counseling, community services, and the special needs of the exceptionally talented, the unemployed and underemployed, the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped, the elderly and minorities.

1) A community college shall have the authority to provide liberal arts and general education programs.

2) A community college shall have the authority to provide postsecondary occupational education programs.

3) A community college shall have the authority to provide continuing education programs.

4) A community college shall have the authority to provide community services programs.

5) A community college shall have the authority to offer developmental education programs.

6) A community college shall have the authority to provide instructional support services, student personnel services, and institutional research

services appropriate to the educational programming of the community.

7) A community college may provide programs or courses for pupils enrolled in high school when requested to do so or when approved by the appropriate authority of the school system in which the pupil is enrolled.

8) A community college may provide area vocational education programs when requested to do so by the appropriate educational authorities.

9) A community college shall endeavor to maintain a tuition policy so that students are not barred from access to educational opportunities by virtue of inadequate finances.

Funding

It is the feeling of the Task Force that regardless of the allocation method used there is general agreement on the following funding concepts.

1) It seems appropriate that instruction to provide a more constructive use of leisure-time and which also provides an introductory bridge to the more traditional academic world is essential to serving the needs of our citizens. The committee believes this type of instruction should continue to be an equally shared funding responsibility.

The criterion model which we are recommending is designed to faithfully represent current operational needs, outputs and costs; and to provide a common basis for dialogue in making funding decisions regarding Michigan Community Colleges.

2) The committee recommends that funding responsibility should be shared on a 50/50 basis between the state and the local districts. Together with this, we recommend that no deducts be used to reach a net figure, but rather both the state and the local units be free to meet their 50% responsibility according to the ability of each.

3) The committee also recommends that the initial step in allocating available state funds be to equalize the tax base of community college districts

so that local revenue supports 25% of the average per student cost. Each institution will then have an equal chance to fulfill its mission and roles.

4) Economies of scale which allow large institutions to operate more efficiently than smaller institutions should be recognized in a way which will not penalize institutions for marginal growth.

5) The increased equity provided by the criterion based model could conceivably be lost if data were not accurate and uniform system-wide. It is the recommendation of the Task Force that an appropriation sufficient to carry out major changes in data management and collection be made to each community college and that implementation of this model will be withheld until such time as the model can be validated and the consequences can be determined.

6) Funding for such data collection activities could be provided through a reallocation of funds already appropriated to community colleges where actual CYES enrollments did not reach authorized levels.

State-Local Relations

1) The state legislature should maintain and be sensitive to institutional autonomy as it relates to the constitution and court decisions.

2) State agencies should be required to conduct hearings or discussions with community colleges prior to the preparation of rules and regulations which impact community colleges.

3) Provision should be made for the use of "oversight hearings" to address situations where regulations exceed statutory authority or legislative intent.

4) The Task Force recommends that there be a mechanism of state-wide focus for planning and advising.

Data is being collected on the attitudes and opinions of board members, faculty, and community college presidents regarding governance which will be available for consideration.

I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

Over the past two or three years, concerns have been raised in regard to the funding formula for state support of public community and junior colleges. In 1976, the Legislature included a provision in the community college appropriations act calling for recommendations and alternatives for funding support to community college education.

This legislation, Section 16 of Senate Bill 1346 (Act No. 244 of the Public Acts of 1976), resulted in the creation of a Task Force consisting of the presidents of the state's 29 public community and junior colleges or their representatives. This report of the Task Force represents a cooperative effort on the part of task force members, staffs of the House and Senate Fiscal Agencies, Department of Education, and Department of Management and Budget. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges was designated as the agency responsible for coordination of the task force activities.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In 1976, there were 29 public community and junior colleges in Michigan, enrolling 188,000 students on a full-time and part-time basis, nearly 40 percent of all collegiate enrollments in the state. This compares to a total of 23 community colleges in 1966, with 68,000 students. Five of the existing community colleges, originating as junior colleges, are more than fifty years old.

Community colleges are funded chiefly from state appropriations (44 percent), local property taxes (25 percent), student fees (22 percent), and revenues from federal and other sources (9 percent).

In June, 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education outlined a number of goals and expectations to serve as policy guidelines for community college development. The Carnegie Commission envisaged the following goals:

- Open access to all public community colleges.
- The removal of financial barriers to enrollment.
- A state plan for the development of community colleges in every state.
- Comprehensive programs with meaningful learning options in all public two-year institutions of higher education.
- Achievement of the goal of a community college within commuting distance of every potential student, except in sparsely populated areas where residential colleges are needed.
- Low tuition or no tuition in community colleges.
- Adaptation of occupational programs to changing manpower requirements and full opportunities for continuing adult education.

The Michigan system of public community and junior colleges represents significant achievement towards accomplishment of each of these goals, to an extent unequaled in all but a few of the other states.

OPERATION OF THE TASK FORCE

At its initial meeting in August, 1976, the Task Force identified three areas of concern: (1)Mission and Roles of community colleges; (2) development of a Funding Model necessary to provide adequate and

equitable support, and (3) clarification of State-Local responsibilities in planning and coordination.

Three committees were organized to examine the areas of concern in greater detail, and to develop alternatives and recommendations. The committee met over a six-month period, with a review of the preliminary committee reports by the full Task Force in December, 1976, and a final review in January, 1977.

This report contains a summary of major conclusions and recommendations of the individual committee reports as supported by the full Task Force. In addition, supporting documentation and materials are also included.

II

MISSION AND ROLES

MISSION

A community college shall serve as a postsecondary educational institution providing, primarily for all persons who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance and primarily for those within commuting distance, degree or non-degree programs, courses and services established to meet the educational requirements of the college service area, which may result in the granting of diplomas and certificates including those known as associate degrees but not including high school diplomas or baccalaureate or graduate degrees.

Such programs, courses and services shall reflect the needs of those persons residing in the college service area, including, but not limited to, guidance and counseling, community services, and the special needs of the exceptionally talented, the unemployed and underemployed, the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped, the elderly and minorities.

ROLE STATEMENTS

1. A community college shall have the authority to provide liberal arts and general education programs including organized instruction with supportive guidance, counseling, and advisement services designed to prepare persons for life roles as citizens and family members, and to provide students with coursework creditable toward certificates, associate degrees, and degrees awarded by baccalaureate institutions.
2. A community college shall have the authority to provide postsecondary occupational education programs including organized

instruction, vocational guidance, counseling, and placement services designed to prepare persons for entering or re-entering the labor market, and for persons preparing to achieve stability or advancement as semi-skilled or skilled workers or as technicians or professionals.

3. A community college shall have the authority to provide continuing education programs offering organized instruction to meet the needs of residents, employers, and organizations in the college service area.
4. A community college shall have the authority to provide community services programs designed to meet the non-academic and non-degree social, cultural, and educational needs of its service area, including community development, problem solving, resource sharing, and personal development activities, and counseling services.
5. A community college shall have the authority to offer developmental education programs for students who enter with inadequate skills and may establish programs which encourage the students to proceed at their own pace and in which their own progress, rather than adherence to set schedules, becomes the criterion for success.
6. A community college shall have the authority to provide instructional support services, student personnel services, and institutional research services appropriate to the educational programming of the community college.
7. A community college may provide programs or courses for pupils enrolled in high school when requested to do so or when approved by the appropriate authority of the school system in which the pupil is enrolled.

8. A community college may provide area vocational education programs when requested to do so by appropriate educational authorities.
9. A community college shall endeavor to maintain a tuition policy so that students, after receipt of other financial assistance that they may be eligible for, are not barred from access to educational opportunities by virtue of inadequate finances.

III

FUNDING

In response to Public Act 244 of the Public Acts of 1976 (SB1346), the community colleges coordinated by the State Board for Community and Junior Colleges have been meeting since August 10, 1976 to respond to the legislative concerns set forth in Section 16.

The Task Force wishes to acknowledge the full cooperation and contribution of the Senate and House Fiscal Agencies, the Department of Management and Budget, the Department of Education, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, the Michigan Community College Association, the Community College Business Officials and the twenty-nine Community College Presidents. Appreciation must also be expressed to the Community College Boards of Trustees for their contribution in permitting the enormous time commitment necessary to accomplish the task requested by the legislature. Finally the Task Force wishes to express its appreciation to the legislature for providing an appropriate vehicle to address concerns jointly shared in constructive dialogues. It is hoped that future policy may have the benefit of such a continuing approach.

In addressing the question of funding, the Task Force subcommittee assigned this task, specifically examined funding models from other states, average cost funding and the criterion approach which responds to the legislative request for an examination of various funding alternatives.

In considering the matter of leisure-time courses, the Task Force considered both the philosophical as well as the financial implications of this matter. As set forth in the mission and roles section, it is appropriate for community colleges to provide organized instruction "designed to prepare persons for life roles as citizens and family members . . . and to meet the

non-academic and non-degree social, cultural and educational needs of its service area."

While it is true that in some instances such instruction may provide for a more constructive use of leisure-time, it is equally true that we have a society which provides, and is likely to continue to provide, an ever-increasing amount of leisure-time to its citizens. In addition, we have an increasing percentage of our population known as senior citizens which statistics indicate will continue to increase to the year 2,000 A.D.

It seems appropriate that insturction to provide a more constructive use of leisure-time and which also provides an introductory bridge to the more traditional academic world is essential to serving the needs of our citizens.

If such instruction had been funded fully in the current year, the cost to the state would have been $2,681,654.00.

After great deliberation and serious examination of the issue, the committee believes this type of instruction should continue to be an equally shared funding responsibility.

The criterion model which we are recommending is designed to:

1) faithfully represent current operational needs, outputs and costs; and
2) provide a common basis for dialogue in making funding decisions regarding Michigan Community Colleges.

In accomplishing these ends, it was necessary to make certain policy decisions regarding performance standards as follows:

1) Faculty compensation should be based upon the 90th percentile of Category IV of the AAUP Compensation Survey for the prior

year ($23,320 for full-time faculty).

2) Instructional support compensation should be based upon a similar Professional/Support ratio (4/1) and compensation level to that found in Michigan Civil Service.

3) The instructional year should be defined as 32 contact weeks of activity or equipment.

4) The expectation for weekly faculty load should be 30 contact hours.

5) A unique feature of the funding model we are recommending is a program classification structure based upon varying class sizes across 5 different delivery design modes. THis is currently being done nowhere else in the country and seems to reflect the unique features of community colleges.

We feel class size expectations for the different delivery design modes should be as follows:

General Instruction	22
Lab 1 (Bio. and Phys. Sci.)	18
Lab 2 (Voc./Tech.)	12
Lab 3 (Health)	10
Lab 4 (Communications/Remedial)	15

6) In addition to class size, faculty load and support costs, it is necessary to include costs for non-capital equipment, materials, and supplies within the cost of each instructional unit.

We recommend the following percentages of compensation be used to represent these costs.

General Instruction	5%
Lab 1 (Bio. and Phys. Sci.)	10%
Lab 2 (Voc./Tech.)	15%
Lab 3 (Health)	20%
Lab 4 (Communications/Remedial)	5%

7) Need levels for institutional support, academic support and public service are closely related to the instructional activity taking place. We recommend they be funded at 55%, 15%, and 3.7% of instruction, respectively.

Once need has been defined according to the above policy decisions, additional policy decisions must be made in order to provide equity in the allocation of funds as follows:

1) We recommend that funding responsibility should be shared on a 50/50 basis between the state and the local districts. Together with this, we recommend that no deducts be used to reach a net figure, but rather both the state and the local units be free to meet their 50% responsibility according to the ability of each.
2) We recommend that the initial step in allocating available state funds be to equalize the tax base of community college districts so that local revenue supports 25% of the average per student cost. Each institution will then have an equal chance to fulfill its mission and roles.
3) Economics of scale which allow large institutions to operate more efficiently than smaller institutions should be recognized in a way which will not penalize institutions for marginal growth.

   To accomplish this, the first 25 instructional units should be funded at a 10% differential and the second 25 units funded at a 7% differential at <u>each institution</u>. All additional instructional units would be funded at a base cost sufficient to total the state responsibility.

In developing the criterion based model, the Task Force addressed the legislative concerns regarding accurate data. The increased equity provided by the criterion based model could conceivably be lost if data were not accurate and uniform system-wide.

To insure that the necessary data required to test the model for validity may be collected in an accurate and timely fashion, it is the recommendation of the Task Force that an appropriation sufficient to carry out major changes in data management and collection be made to each community college.

Funding for such data collection activities could be provided through a reallocation of funds already appropriated to community colleges where actual CYES enrollments did not reach authorized levels.

A test period of possibly one year should be established in order to verify the applicability of these models. During that time the following two efforts should be made:

a) To gather data based upon uniform definition of student contact hours by delivery design categories, and;

b) To make comparisons of actual data in relation to policy selection taking rise in the model.

The Task Force supports the workability and the continuation of the current formula until the proposed criterion model has been thoroughly tested. The gross allocation factor should be redetermined based on the 1973-74 gross allocation factors adjusted for annual changes in the higher education price index.

IV

SUMMARY OF STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

In line with constitutional and statutory law, the Task Force recommends the following division of governance responsibility at the state and local levels with regard to Michigan community colleges.

Recommendation 1: State and Local Responsibilities

The State

A. DEFINES

-Basic mission of community colleges

-Basic organizational options for accomplishing the mission

-Revenue sources which may be used, and the limits of that usage

B. DETERMINES

-Services in which the State will invest

-Level of the State investment

-Methods for allocating the State investment

C. ALLOCATES

-The State investment

D. MONITORS

-The State investment

-Degree to which basic mission is accomplished

-Implementation of the law

The Local District

A. DEFINES

- Specific policies for accomplishing the mission

-Organizational plan for accomplishing the mission

B. DETERMINES

-Amount of Local revenues generated

-Services to be rendered

C. CONTROLS

-Expenditure of funds for accomplishing mission

-Management and delivery of services

D. ACCOUNTABLE FOR

-Adequacy of services rendered

-Balancing revenue and expenditures

-Compliance with the law

Recommendation 2: Institutional Autonomy

The state legislature should maintain and be sensitive to institutional autonomy as it relates to the constitution and court decisions.

Recommendation 3: Rules and Regulations

State agencies should be required to conduct hearings or discussions with community colleges prior to the preparation of rules and regulations which impact community colleges.

Recommendation 4: Oversight Hearings

Provision should be made for the use of "oversight hearings" through mediums such as the Joint Administrative Rules Committee to address situations where regulations exceed statutory authority or legislative intent.

Recommendation 5: State-Wide Planning

The Task Force recommends that there be a mechanism of state-wide planning and advising.

APPENDIX A

EXCERPT FROM SENATE BILL 1346 (Act No. 244, Public Acts of 1976)

Sec. 16. (1) The 29 community colleges in cooperation with the senate fiscal agency, the house fiscal agency, and the department of management and budget shall develop recommendation alternatives for funding support to community college education. These recommendations should specifically address the state role with regard to funding leisure time courses. Recommendations should also be made for defining role, responsibility and program scope for adult basic education and high school completion courses.

(2) The recommendations should also address legislative concerns about funding equity for the various types of instructional programs offered, the ability and effort of local districts to support community college programs, the need for a program classification structure which addresses the unique features of community colleges, and desirability of funding approach which is based on performance expectations rather than average costs.

(3) Recommendations should also be made regarding legislative concerns about the accuracy of enrollment projections, the problem of course completions, and such other concerns as have been cited in previous appropriations acts or enunciated by the legislature.

(4) The cooperative effort shall be coordinated under the leadership of the state board for community and junior colleges and a final report including recommendation alternatives shall be submitted to the executive office and both appropriations committees of the legislature not later than February 1, 1977.

APPENDIX B

TASK FORCE

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

August 10, 1976	TASK FORCE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
August 24, 1976	TASK FORCE MEETING Selection and organization of Sub-Committees
August 25 - October 20	Sub-Committee meetings
October 21, 1976	TASK FORCE MEETING Review Sub-Committee reports; develop recommendations for further study
October 22 - November 22	Sub-Committee meetings
November 23, 1976	TASK FORCE MEETING Review additional draft materials from Sub-Committees
November 24 - December 2	Sub-Committee meetings
December 3, 1976	TASK FORCE MEETING Review Draft Task Force Report
December 4 - January 10	Sub-Committee meetings
January 11, 1977	FINAL TASK FORCE MEETING Review and approve Task Force Report
January 12 - 31, 1977	Incorporate revisions into report as approved by Task Force. Final typing and reproduction of copies for distribution.
February 1, 1977	Task Force Report submitted to Executive Office and Legislature.

APPENDIX C

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDING MODEL

MODEL FOR DETERMINATION OF INVESTMENT NEEDS AND ALLOCATION OF STATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

A PROPOSAL PREPARED BY THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TASK FORCE COMMITTEE ON FUNDING

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TASK FORCE ON FUNDING

At the December 22, 1976 meeting of the Community College Task Force, the following items were approved:

1) The following changes should be included in the criterion model:

   a) Faculty compensation level should be based on the AAUP 90th percentile level.

   b) Academic Support should be set at 15% of instruction.

   c) Faculty load should be set at 30 contact hours annually.

   d) Institutional support should be set at 53% of instruction.

   e) The size factor should be 0 - 25 units plus 10% and 26 - 50 units plus 7%.

2) The Task Force goes on record in support of the funding models as presented as being conceptually sound on the system wide basis.

3) The test period of possibly one year being established in order to verify the applicability of these models. During that time two efforts should be made:

   a) To gather data based upon uniform definition of student contact hours by delivery design categories.

   b) To make comparisons of actual data in relation to policy selection taking rise in the model.

   It is recommended that a supplemental appropriation be made to the community colleges to cover the costs of change over to new data collection demands.

4) The Task Force supports the workability and the continuation of the current formula until the proposed criterion model has been thoroughly tested. The gross allocation factor should be redetermined based on the 1973-74 gross allocation factors adjusted for annual changes in the higher education price index.

5) The final report of this Task Force Committee should be submitted to each community college for evaluation and official reaction as to its validity and applicability.

6) Since the appropriation bill originates in the Senate, the Senate Fiscal Agency should be designated as the Agency to coordinate the collection of data required to test the models.

INTRODUCTION

This proposed Model is composed of two sections. The first presents a criterion based approach for use in estimating the gross general fund investment needs of the Michigan Community College system. Section 2 focuses upon a method for allocating state appropriations in recognition of a) the investment needs identified in Section 1 and b) local revenues potentially available to community colleges to augment the state appropriations.

The Model is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Identify the inputs and outputs of the system needed to respond to public demand.
2. Utilize measurement criteria which can be documented with reference to both state and national trends as well as program content and delivery design characteristics.
3. Establish linkages between need/demand, performance output, resource requirements, and cost.
4. Respond to role and mission differences and commonalities which exist among the institutional components of the system.
5. Enable prioritization of state resource allocations.
6. Respond to systemic program changes on a timely basis.
7. Encourage stabilization of the Community College appropriations process.
8. Facilitate a common basis for the discussion and debate of Community college issues which have funding implications.
9. Facilitate equitable funding predicated upon the recognition of program needs.

SECTION I

THE DETERMINATION OF GROSS GENERAL FUND INVESTMENT NEEDS FOR THE MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

DEFINITION OF MEASUREMENT CRITERIA

STRUCTURE

Define gross general fund investment need in terms of the following functional categories which reflect Community College operations:

Instruction: Defined as all formalized instruction which occurs with reference to five major instructional delivery designs (See Volume Measure Factor).

Academic Support: Library Services, museums, gallerys, computer support, academic administration, curricula development, ancilliary support, and academic personnel development.

Public Service: Non-instructional community services exclusive of continuing education.

Student Service: Admissions and records, counseling and career guidance, student auxilliary services, social/cultural activities, financial aid administration and student services administration.

Financial Aid: Loans, scholarships and grants-in-aid.

Institutional Support: Executive management, fiscal operations, general administrative services, logistical support, physical plant operation, public relations and development, and faculty and staff auxilliary support.

INSTRUCTION

1. VOLUME MEASURE FACTOR

Annual Student Contact Hours (SCOH) of formalized instruction rendered in each of five instructional delivery designs:

Laboratory I = Biological and Physical Science portion of academic program exclusive of lecture and seminar delivery design (Laboratory hours only).

Laboratory II = Vocational-Technical Laboratory exclusive of lecture and seminar delivery design (Laboratory hours only).

Laboratory III = Health Laboratory exclusive of lecture and seminar delivery design (Laboratory hours only).

Laboratory IV = Contacts based on preparation for college level work. English composition, Fundemental Skill-PPE-College.

General Instruction = All other instructional hours including non-laboratory portions of vocational, health, and biological physical science programs and mathematical-liberal arts programs.

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

2. Performance Criteria Factor

Define performance expectations in terms of SCOH per teacher for each delivery design based upon the examination of systemic trends and program characteristics regarding class size and teacher load.

Recommended Criteria:

Delivery Design	Annual SCOH/Unit
General Instruction	660
Biological & Physical Science Labs	540
Vocational Technical Labs	360
Health Labs	300
Communication & Remedial Labs	450

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

3. Resource Requirement Factor

Calculate the estimated number of instructional units needed by dividing the performance criteria of each delivery design into total annual SCOH produced by that design.

Calculate total instructional units by summing the number of units produced in each delivery design.

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

4. Base Cost Translation

The following instructional unit cost translation is based on the assumption that each unit includes 1 faculty member, 1/4 support person equivalent, and a supply, material and equipment base to support on-going programs.

A. Faculty Compensation:

Estimate faculty compensation costs based on the 90th percentile of Category IV of the National AAUP Compensation Survey for the prior year. Project cost increases for future year by inflating these estimates using the Higher Education Price Index.

B. Support Personnel Costs:

Determine the support personnel cost of each instructional unit by dividing the projected year estimate of State Civil Service Compensation for support personnel by 4. (Assumes a faculty to support person ratio of 4 to 1).

C. Supply, Material & Equipment Costs:

The instructional unit cost does vary by delivery design according to differing supply, material and equipment requirements. These requirements are described as percentages of total projected faculty and support personnel compensation and are defined as follows:

Delivery Design	% of Total Compensation
General Instruction	5%
Biological & Physical Sci. Labs	10%
Vocational Technical Labs	15%
Health Labs	20%
Communication & Remedial Labs	5%

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

4. Base Cost Translation (Continued)

TABLE I

INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT COST TRANSLATION INDEX

Delivery Designs	1975-76 AAUP Faculty Compensation	1977-78 Estimated Support Pers. Comp.	% of Comp. for SM&E	INSTR. UNIT COST TOTALS
General Instruction	$23,320	$3,050	$1,318	$27,688
Bio. & Phys. Labs	23,320	3,050	2,637	29,007
Voc. Tech. Labs	23,320	3,050	3,955	30,325
Health Labs	23,320	3,050	5,274	31,644
Com./Remed. Labs	23,320	3,050	1,318	27,688

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

TABLE II

APPLICATION OF BASE COST TRANSLATION

A. [ANNUAL SCOH PRODUCED BY EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN] ÷ 30 ÷ [PERFORMANCE CRITERIA OF EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN] = [NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS FOR EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN]

B. [TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS PRODUCED FOR EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN] × [UNIT COST OF EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN] = [BASE INVESTMENT NEED FOR EACH INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN]

C. The sum of base investment needs for each instructional design equals the base estimate for instruction.

TABLE III

Instructional Delivery Design	Performance Criteria SCOH/Unit	Instructional Unit Cost
General Instruction	660	$27,688
Biological or Physical Sci. Lab.	540	29,007
Vocational Technical Lab.	360	30,325
Health Lab.	300	31,644
Communication or Remedial Lab.	450	27,688

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

5. Instructional Complexity Factor

The instructional complexity factor is based on the fact that actual SCOH performance ratios will vary from the performance criteria of the Model. This variance may occur as a function of one or more of the following:

- Student population decline through the instructional "pipeline" of highly specialized programs.
- Reduced class size or instruction load associated with unique delivery designs of experimental programs.
- Student population constraints in new and developing programs.
- Institutional variances associated with the mix of faculty effort in instruction, advisement, administration, course preparation, and community service.

These variances do represent positive features of diversity and innovation. To the extent that they are essential to the fulfillment of recognized institutional role and mission, they do merit consideration. The instructional complexity factor is calculated systemically on a program basis rather than institutionally. This approach is warranted in that the state of the art concerning educational systems analysis is not sufficiently advanced to isolate the precise educational merits of each variance and the resulting impact on an institution's role and mission fulfillment.

The SCOH/FTEF was selected as a variable because this factor is the central driving force of the Model.

INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

5. Instructional Complexity Factor (Continued)

TABLE IV

APPLICATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COMPLEXITY FACTOR

SYSTEM WIDE ACTUAL NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS I.E. FTEF APPLIED TO BASE COST TRANSLATION	—	SYSTEM WIDE RESULTS OF BASE COST TRANSLATION	X .5 =	ADDED COST INVESTMENT AS A FUNCTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL COMPLEXITY

SUMMARY

The total gross general fund investment need for the instructional component of the model is determined by adding two factors, namely:

BASE INVESTMENT	+	INSTRUCTIONAL COMPLEXITY INVESTMENT	=	TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL INVESTMENT NEED

ACADEMIC SUPPORT

Recent research on Academic Support service costs by the Higher Education Task Force shows an extremely significant correlational relationship between instructional expenditures and expenditures for academic support. Data from fiscal 1974-75 and 1975-76 suggests that academic support costs equalled between 13% and 14% of instructional costs. However, as major cutbacks are thought to have affected academic support expenditures, it is recommended that academic support investment need be defined as follows:

TOTAL INVESTMENT NEED FOR INSTRUCTION MODEL DERIVED	X	15.0%	=	ACADEMIC SUPPORT INVESTMENT NEED

PUBLIC SERVICE

An examination of Public Services expenditures for 1974-75 and 1975-76 indicates that expenditures for non-instructional public service are constant at approximately 3.7 of the systemic instructional cost. Based on this examination it is recommended that the public service systemic investment need be defined as a percentage of the instructional need derived by the Model as follows:

[TOTAL INVESTMENT NEED FOR INSTRUCTION MODEL DERIVED] X 3.7% = [PUBLIC SERVICE INVESTMENT NEED]

STUDENT SERVICES

An examination of institutional expenditures for the 1974-75 fiscal year indicates a high correlation between student service costs and the number of people (headcount) being served. This appears to be true as students require similar admissions and records, counseling, career guidance, and placement services regardless of how many credit hours they are taking. On a systemic basis, student service expenditures for 1974-75, plus a standard Higher Education Price Index inflation factor of 6.5%, results in a per headcount expenditure of $69.00 for 1975-76. It is recommended that the student service systemic investment need be defined as the prior year student service expenditure per student plus the inflation factor indicated by the Higher Education Price Index, times total systemic headcount as follows:

[PRIOR YEAR EXPENDITURE PER HEADCOUNT] X [HEPI INFLATION FACTOR] X HEADCOUNT = [SYSTEMIC STUDENT SERVICES INVESTMENT NEED]

FINANCIAL AID

Community College Financial Aid costs, exclusive of administrative costs which are included in the Student Services component, are attributable directly to expenditures for matching requirements in federal financial aid programs (10% of National Direct Student Loan Grants, 20% of Federal Work-Study Grants). A second cost area involves expenditures for direct trustee scholarships. It is recommended that the financial aid systemic investment need be defined as prior year actual expenditures in matching federal financial aid grants plus a standard inflation factor indicated by the Higher Education Price Index as follows:

PRIOR YEAR NON-ADMINISTRATIVE FINANCIAL AID EXPENDITURE	X	6.5%	=	SYSTEMIC FINANCIAL AID INVESTMENT NEED

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Recent research on Institutional Support costs by the Higher Education Task Force shows a significant correlational relationship between instructional expenditures and expenditures for institutional support. Fiscal 1974-75 and 1975-76 expenditure data suggests that institutional support costs equalled 50% to 52% of instructional expenditures. However, as it is thought major cutbacks occurred in the instructional support area, it is recommended that institutional support investment need be defined as follows:

[TOTAL DERIVED INVESTMENT NEED FOR INSTRUCTION MODEL] X 55% = [SYSTEMIC INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT INVESTMENT NEED]

SUMMARY

THE TOTAL GROSS GENERAL FUND ESTIMATE OF SYSTEM WIDE INVESTMENT NEED IS DETERMINED BY THE SUM OF INVESTMENT NEEDS FOR EACH COMPONENT:

THE SUM OF,

INSTRUCTION

ACADEMIC SUPPORT

PUBLIC SERVICE

STUDENT SERVICE

FINANCIAL AID

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

EQUALS THE GROSS GENERAL FUND INVESTMENT NEED OF THE SYSTEM.

SECTION II

A METHOD FOR THE ALLOCATION OF STATE FUNDS BASED ON THE DETERMINATION NEEDS MODEL

INTRODUCTION

The proposed method for allocating state resources is advocated as one means of accomplishing the following objectives:

- Eliminate use of specific institutional deducts in allocating state aid.
- Recognize program differences among institutions.
- Respond to economies and diseconomies associated with size of the enrollment base.
- Define the establishment of tuition rates as an institutional responsibility.
- Establish a priority base for the allocation process.

THE METHODOLOGY

STEP 1

Define the gross general fund need of the system according to the findings of the investment needs determination model.

STEP 2

Define the share of systemic investment need to be borne by the state and the institution respectively.

The Committee recommends that the financial burden of support for the Community College system be shared equally by the state and the local districts, i.e., 50% of the model defined investment need to be covered through state appropriations, and 50% to be raised by local revenue resources; namely, taxes and tuition.

STEP 3

a. Equalize actual local tax millage generated for operations up to a maximum of one mill. Base this equalization on actual prior year enrollments and SEV.

b. Determine the gross general fund investment need per FYES.

c. Calculate 25% of gross general fund need/FYES.

d. Equalize the difference between 25% of gross general fund need/FYES and local SEV levied up to one mill.

e. Subtract total dollars allocated by equalization process from the state investment responsibility.

STEP 4

a. Equate instructional unit costs based on a weighted index derived from cost differentials established by the investment needs model. See Table V.

TABLE V

Instruction Delivery Design	Wtd. Cost Index	Total Instructional Units	Wtd. Total Instructional Units
General Instruction	1.000	2,240	2,240
Bio. & Physical Sci. Lab.	1.048	172	180
Vocational Technical Lab.	1.095	552	604
Health Lab.	1.143	358	409
Communication & Rem. Lab.	1.000	117	117
System Total		3,437	3,550

b. Divide remaining state investment responsibility by total number of weighted instructional units for the system to establish allocation base per weighted instructional unit.

c. Adjust the allocation base per instructional unit to reflect the size variable using the following formula:

[First 25 units X $ rate + 10%] + [Second 25 units X $ rate + 7%] + [All Other Units X $ rate]

= TOTAL ALLOCATION

STEP 5

Apply Step 4 by multiplying results by the number of weighted instructional units produced at each institution.

STEP 6

The prison program is sponsored for wards of the state and as such, the state should be responsible for 100% of the costs. As the determination model includes prison contact hours, an added cost grant should be made to cover the remaining costs as follows:

Average Institutional $ per Contact Hour x Prison Contact Hours x 1.10[1]

STEP 7

Sum the Allocations for Equalization, Instructional Unit Outputs, and Special Grants to arrive at Institutional Allocation.

[1] No data on prison program added costs is currently available. Percentage would be based on added cost expenditures for prison programs once data becomes available.

APPLICATION OF MODEL FOR DETERMINATION OF SYSTEMIC CROSS GENERAL FUND INVESTMENT NEEDS - INSTRUCTION COMPONENT

Instructional Delivery Designs	Total Annual SCOH	Weekly Performance Criteria	Annual Performance Criteria	Total Instructional Units	Cost Translation Per Unit	Systemic Gross Investment Need
General Instruction	50,473,317	660	(21,120)	2,390	$ 27,688	$ 66,174,320
Lab 1	3,172,102	540	(17,280)	184	29,007	5,337,288
Lab 2	6,785,340	360	(11,520)	589	30,325	17,861,425
Lab 3	3,668,558	300	(9,600)	382	31,644	12,088,008
Lab 4	1,793,774	450	(14,400)	125	27,688	3,461,000
					Subtotal	$104,922,041
					Complexity Factor	4,586,544
					TOTAL	$109,508,585

APPLICATION OF MODEL FOR DETERMINATION OF SYSTEMIC GROSS GENERAL FUND ALL COMPONENTS

Instruction	$109,508,585
Academic Support (15% of Instr.)	16,426,287
Public Service (3.7% of Instr.)	4,051,817
Student Service (See page 14 for derivation)	15,538,450
Financial Aid (See page 15 for derivation)	3,105,321
Institutional Support (55% of Instr.)	60,229,721
TOTAL NEED	$208,860,181
STATE RESPONSIBILITY	$104,430,090

PRINT/TOTAL TWO-YEAR 0158,0143,0172,0170,0171

APPLICATION OF ALLOCATION METHOD

TWO-YEAR	Derived Allocation	Equalization Grant	FORMULA TOTAL	PRISON GRANT	TOTAL STATE
Alpena	1,443,121	440,523	1,883,643	0	1,883,643
Bay de Noc	709,042	238,693	947,734	0	947,734
C. S. Mott	5,836,740	749,466	6,586,206	0	6,586,206
Delta	4,631,905	71,177	4,703,082	0	4,703,082
Glen Oaks	533,574	4,981	538,555	0	538,555
Gogebic	891,159	327,551	1,218,710	163,451	1,382,161
Grand Rapids	3,944,788	1,762,027	5,706,815	0	5,706,815
Henry Ford	5,135,311	2,307,085	7,442,396	0	7,442,396
Highland Park	2,160,638	1,145,968	3,306,606	6,575	3,313,181
Jackson	2,665,285	1,072,640	3,737,925	937,915	4,675,840
Kalamazoo	2,944,703	279,267	3,223,970	0	3,223,970
Kellogg	2,062,124	649,225	2,711,349	0	2,711,349
Kirtland	1,039,790	103,260	1,143,051	115,707	1,258,757
Lake Michigan	976,610	0	976,610	0	976,610
Lansing	5,923,953	2,331,496	8,255,449	0	8,255,449
Macomb	10,591,686	2,353,910	12,945,596	0	12,945,596
Mid Michigan	908,369	142,754	1,051,123	0	1,051,123
Monroe	1,028,844	0	1,028,844	0	1,028,844
Montcalm	716,328	136,089	852,417	268,380	1,120,796
Muskegon	2,437,172	891,344	3,328,515	82,693	3,411,209
North Central	781,515	202,062	983,578	13,871	997,449
Northwestern	2,024,924	668,759	2,693,682	0	2,693,682
Oakland	7,540,398	0	7,540,398	0	7,540,398
St. Clair	2,145,644	267,444	2,413,088	0	2,413,088
Schoolcraft	3,498,367	547,907	4,046,274	23,783	4,070,057
Southwestern	1,410,365	324,272	1,734,637	0	1,734,637
Washtenaw	3,262,055	32,921	3,294,976	19,483	3,314,459
Wayne	7,035,414	2,354,186	9,389,600	0	9,389,600
West Shore	745,909	0	745,909	20,801	766,711
TOTAL	85,025,733	19,404,607	104,430,338	1,652,659	106,082,997

PRINT/TOTAL TWO-YEAR 0139,0140,0141,0142,0143

EQUALIZATION PORTION OF ALLOCATION MODEL

TWO-YEAR	SEV on Up to 1 Mill	SBV/CYES	Difference 477-SEV/CYES	Equalization Grant
Alpena	217,000	148	329	440,523
Bay de Noc	200,200	211	266	238,693
C. S. Mott	2,915,000	375	102	749,466
Delta	2,846,439	465	12	71,177
Glen Oaks	324,000	470	7	4,981
Gogebic	78,000	89	388	327,551
Grand Rapids	860,392	150	327	1,762,027
Henry Ford	1,230,795	163	314	2,307,085
Highland Park	101,000	63	414	1,145,968
Jackson	834,219	196	281	1,072,640
Kalamazoo	1,260,000	386	91	279,267
Kellogg	738,605	253	224	649,225
Kirtland	395,000	363	114	103,260
Lake Michigan	1,156,716	609	0	0
Lansing	1,049,871	200	277	2,331,096
Macomb	4,071,000	297	180	2,353,910
Mid Michigan	294,000	309	168	142,754
Monroe	988,319	691	0	0
Montcalm	246,334	304	173	136,089
Muskegon	745,922	211	266	891,344
North Central	184,600	218	259	202,062
Northwestern	320,054	150	327	668,759
Oakland	7,099,000	624	0	0
St. Clair	978,857	373	104	267,444
Schoolcraft	1,855,305	365	112	547,907
Southwestern	279,000	213	264	324,272
Washtenaw	1,817,000	468	9	32,921
Wayne	2,685,250	240	237	2,354,186
West Shore	475,884	647	0	0
TOTAL	37,147,762	9,251	5,245	19,404,607

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

One of the key issues facing Michigan higher education will be the process by which institutions and the State will view and react to the issues of institutional autonomy and the need for State planning and coordination. Prior to the mid 50's, neither colleges and universities nor federal and state governments involved themselves significantly in short and long range planning, nor did a need manifest itself for institutional coordination and cooperation. The interface between these groups was amiable and one of respect. With the large influx of students during the late 50's and early 60's, higher education forced a reallocation of funding and priorities on federal and state governments. With increased funding came the request from the Legislature and the Executive Office for review and accountability. At the same time those receiving a decrease in funds criticized their lower priority in state planning.

As Logan Wilson, Past President of the American Council on Education pointed out in a recent article, in a short period of fifteen years the issue of relative autonomy of colleges and universities and their freedom from unified control and national or state centralized control has moved from far down the agenda to one of the top priorities in higher education.[1]

Robert O. Berdahl in Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, also emphasizes how far centralization has moved in the United States noting that in 1969 only two states had no politically named coordinating agencies and only two continued to rely on

---

[1] "Form and Function in American Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, edited by Logan Wilson (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), pp. 29-37.

voluntary association to perform the coordinating function.[2] John Gardner and Claude Bissell are quoted in Berdahl's book as pointing out rather clearly the issue of autonomy as viewed from the perspective of higher education.

> "The issue of university autonomy will never be finally solved. It can only be lived with." John Gardner

> "Autonomy does not depend upon financial independence, for in these days, no university. . . is financially independent. Nor does it depend upon isolation from politics, which at best is nervous and unreal, for every university these days must engage in constant conversations with those who have been elected to public office. Academic autonomy really depends on a broad social assumption that, despite the exigencies of the moment, we must not make decisions on inadequate information." Claude Bissell

In 1973, William Milliken, Governor of Michigan, in his charge to his newly appointed Commission on Higher Education listed several major concerns.[3] The Governor's charge to the Commission is briefly summarized below:

1. Institutions of higher education have fallen from high regard to where only 33% of the American people express high confidence in educational leadership as compared to a figure of 61% in 1966.
2. Not too many years ago institutions could request resources for capital outlay or operation from the State and although many felt they did not receive all they wished, the rate was such that it probably could be looked on as the golden age for higher education in the history of the United States.

---

[2]Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971

[3]"Governor's Message and Charge to the Commission on Higher Education," January 24, 1973.

Background Material (Continued)

In the last few years it seems that it has almost totally reversed.

3. Because of the dissatisfaction of many students in the late 60's and with the financial crunch and changing of priorities, higher education is being reevaluated. It has to be accountable in ways and forms it never has before.
4. The effectiveness of teaching was also to be reviewed.
5. The validity of the expressed desire of institutions for expansion was questioned.
6. The need for measurement for quality was emphasized and the validity of more buildings, expanded programs and bigger campuses was questioned.

He asked the Commission on Higher Education to be sensitive to what he hoped would be some of the anticipated outcomes and recommendations. His request is summarized below.

The Commission on Higher Education should:

1. Make recommendations regarding planning and coordination of postsecondary education and study the financial needs of postsecondary education.
2. Look carefully at the role and function of higher education in Michigan.
3. Devise a system for more effective planning and coordination.
4. Look for a more effective way for governance.
5. Look for a bold new design for the ordering and delivery of higher education services in Michigan.

At the federal level the Task Force on higher education, known as the Newman Commission, pointed out the trend toward uniformity

Background Material (Continued)

in our institutions, growing bureaucracy, overemphasis on academic credentials, isolation of students from the world and lack of sensitivity to career involvement on the part of higher education. Michigan higher education stands at the crossroad. Most of the states in the union now have centrally developed planning and coordination systems. Michigan's Constitution of 1962 appeared to give the Department of Education the role for coordination and planning. This has been contested in the courts and the autonomy of the individual colleges and universities has been substantiated. Boards of Trustees are the accountable group. Consequently, there is no office designated by law in Michigan that can request cooperation and coordination of higher education. The Executive and legislative offices through appropriations and other approaches do, through their actions, impact the area of planning and coordination. However, the action usually lacks a balanced, long-range impartial approach. Historically Michigan has had a strong commitment to all segments of public education. Over 80% of students in higher education in Michigan attend public institutions. In Ohio and many eastern states the proportion would be almost reversed. In its Constitutions and through court decisions, Michigan has re-emphasized many times its respect for autonomy of local Boards of Education and particularly universities and colleges. Time and time again when clashes have arisen between institutions of higher learning and the Legislature or Governor's office the courts have reaffirmed the autonomy of the institution and the reserve rights of the boards of control.

As has taken place nationally, Michigan has had a number of studies completed regarding the question of coordination and the need for a statewide system. With the exception of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education there have been few direct studies made on this question in the last few years. Studies that have been completed over the last twenty years are:

1. The John Dale Russell study for the legislature which did a complete and detailed review of higher education in Michigan with some of its suggestions implemented in the Constitutional Convention of 1961-62. During the Constitutional Convention there was a major rewriting of the educational article which changed significantly the role of some of the higher educational institutions in Michigan and reinforced the autonomy of universities. At the same time it redefined the role of the State Board of Education and made possible the appointment of an advisory Board for Community and Junior Colleges.
2. In 1965 Governor Romney appointed a fifty-six member Blue Ribbon Citizens' Committee that reviewed higher education. Their major function was to give guidance to the new State Board of Education and to determine the impact of the newly enacted Constitution.
3. In 1966-67 the State Board of Education developed its educational Master Plan which met with little acceptance and had little impact.
4. In 1973 Governor Milliken's Commission on Higher Education was appointed at a time of crises for higher education because of the changing enrollment patterns and limited financial resources.

Areas of Concern in Community College Local-State Relations

A recent article in the Community and Junior College Journal contains this statement:

> A new survey confirms what many educational leaders have been guessing about. The states are exercising increasing control and coordination over the development and administration of public community colleges.[1]

Related to this national issue is the increasing alarm of institutions of higher education over the proliferation of state and federal reporting requirements. The intrusion of governmental agencies and boards into the affairs of local boards of control, the tendency toward over-regulation by state departments and agencies, and excessive reporting requirements: these matters are of concern to members of Boards of Trustees and the Presidents of Michigan community colleges today.

At the national level, HEW Secretary F. David Matthews has instituted sweeping reforms in the way the department develops and issues regulations. In Michigan, too, the process of developing rules and regulations by agencies which interpret legislative intent requires careful examination; and the number of State agencies whose activities impinge upon community college curricular planning appears to be growing: auto mechanics licensing in one agency, real estate licensing in another, nursing certification in another, and general vocational education standards in still another. Here the issue is not the right of such agencies to establish standards for licensure or certification, but the tendency to go beyond standards to dictate specific curricular requirements and to mandate other actions which represent an intrusion into the province of local community college Boards of Trustees.

[1] S. V. Martorana and W. Gary McGuire. "Survey Confirms Trend Toward State Control," Community and Junior College Journal, Sept. 1976, p.8.

Areas of Concern (Continued)

A significant amount of clarification of the role of various State agencies and boards as they relate to community colleges is needed. One route to such clarification is illustrated by the recent request by the Superintendent of Public Instruction for an Attorney General's opinion as to the State Department of Education's role in certain licensure areas. Certainly it is hoped that the new State plan for higher education will speak to this issue as well.

It is recommended that any changes in formal or informal relationships between community colleges and State boards and agencies be based on those problems cited by Michigan community college Presidents in a November, 1976, State-wide survey:

1. A primary concern is the maintenance of the autonomy of local Boards of Trustees in governing their institutions. Two sets of problems emerge here:
   A. Mandated requirements, such as through VTES (Vocational Technical Education Service) and MIOSHA, (Michigan Occupationsl Safety & Health Act) which are filtered down on the basis of federal legislation.
   B. Of greater centrality to the matter of local-state relationships is the issue of the interpretation of legislative intent by State agencies. The result may be rules and regulations which intrude into local autonomy. The definition of learning activities or requirements which go beyond legislative intent represents the most common form of intrusion by licensing and other agencies. At least two immediate steps may assist in this area:
      (1) A requirement that State agencies conduct hearings or discussions with community college Presidents or their

Areas of Concern (Continued)

designees prior to the preparation of rules and regulations which impact community colleges.

(2) The use of "oversight hearings"--perhaps through the medium of the Joint Administrative Rules Committee--when community college representatives feel rules and regulations do not reflect legislative intent.

2. A second problem involves the area of role definition and "planning and coordination" at the State level. The specific roles of the numerous boards and agencies involved needs definition. Also, the scope of State-level community college planning might be reviewed.

   Even more basic may be the clarification of the planning and coordination role of the State Board of Education, the State Community College Board, the State Department of Education, and other State bureaus and departments, and the control role of local Boards of Trustees. Community college Presidents cite recent taxonomies, vocational education standards of quality, and community services definitions as examples of efforts that appear to move into the control area. The State Constitution and community college law form the basis for the resolution of this matter.

3. The control of reporting requirements is becoming increasingly necessary. Between 90 and 100 reports now flow between community colleges and the State Department of Education, the majority being federal reports. The continuing questions are: What are the results? How is the data used? Can the paperwork be reduced?

4. A major issue is the proper balance between State and local funding for community colleges, and the possible erosion of

Areas of Concern (Continued)

that balance with a greater burden falling on local districts. Related to this is the frequent changing of boilerplate language and gross allowances in the State aid formula. The lack of dependable and adequate funding causes insecurity and frustration at the local level.

5. Many non-educational statutes such as unemployment compensation, single business tax, civil rights, etc., directly impact community colleges. While this is to some extent the result of federal mandates, State-level decisions should take into account the need for involvement by community colleges and other institutions.
6. The need for improved articulation, communication, and joint planning between all institutions of higher education in Michigan, and the related State boards and agencies, still exists. Competition for funds, programs, and students is to some extent always present, but it appears that this will intensify in the future.

Involvement Patterns in Michigan Governance

The question of who and how with regard to involvement in the Michigan governance process is very complex. An almost endless array of organizations have a potential for influencing the community college enterprise. This is not surprising given the fact that the decision making process is not narrowly defined.

In attempting to describe patterns of involvement in Michigan governance, the State policy decision making process was divided into six phases:

1. Identification and giving visibility to policy issues
2. Formulating policy alternatives
3. Making policy recommendations
4. Policy decision making
5. Policy implementation
6. Policy review

Phase I. Identifying and Giving Visibility to Policy Issues

In examining Phase I, it was discovered that a considerable number of organizations are involved in identifying and giving visibility to community college issues. These organizations have certain characteristics in common.

First, it is in the best interest of community colleges to be responsive to and/or demonstrate accountability for its actions to these organizations. Second, articulation linkages must be maintained with these organizations if the community college is to successfully accomplish its mission. Third, involvement of many of these organizations in the community college movement may be sporadic. However, at a given time, that involvement can have a profound impact.

The following organizations have been identified as having a potential for involvement in Phase I of the Michigan policy decision making process:

1. Governor
2. Legislature - Legislative Committees
3. Department of Management & Budget
4. Legislative Fiscal Agencies
5. State Board of Education
6. Department of Education
7. SBE Advisory Councils
8. Auditor General
9. Attorney General
10. Judicial System
11. State Board for Public Community & Junior Colleges
12. Vocational Education Council
13. Licensure & Regulation Boards
14. Michigan Community College Association
15. MEA/MFT/AAUP
16. State Teachers Retirement Board
17. County Board of Commissioners
18. Michigan Finance Commission
19. State Tax Commission
20. Higher Education Assistance Authority
21. Labor Organizations - UAW/AFL/CIO/Teamsters/etc.
22. Local Boards of Trustees - President
23. Student Organizations
24. Community Organizations
25. News Media
26. President's Aministrators
27. Local Institution Labor Organizations
28. Regional Consortia
29. Baccalaureate Institutions (Public & Private)
30. Special Ad Hoc Commissions & Study Committees
31. Michigan Employment Security Commission
32. Michigan Employment Relations Commission
33. U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare
34. U.S. Department of Labor
35. Professional Associations

Involvement Patterns in Michigan Governance (Continued)

36. Accrediting Organizationa
37. K-12 Districts
38. Business, Industry, Agricultural Organizations

In establishing a list of organizations which impact the governance system with regard to State-wide policy decisions (Phases II through VI), the following criterion was used: The organization should have an on-going, first order involvement which affects the scope of community college services on a system-wide basis. Organizations included in Phases II through Phase VI are as follows:

Phase II: Formulating Policy Alternatives

1. Department of Management & Budget
2. Legislative Fiscal Agencies
3. Department of Education
4. Boards of Trustees - Presidents

Phase III: Making Policy Recommendations

	Proposer (s)	Receiver (s)
1.	Governor	Legislature
2.	Legislative Committees	Legislature
3.	Department of Management & Budget	Governor
4.	Legislative Fiscal Agencies	Legislative Committees
5.	Department of Education	State Board of Education
6.	State Board of Education	Governor/Legislature
7.	Auditor General	Legislature
8.	State Bd. of Community & Jr. Colleges	State Board of Education
9.	SBE Advisory Councils	State Board of Education
10.	Higher Education Assistance Auth.	State Board of Education
11.	State Teachers Retirement Board	Governor/Legislature
12.	Mich. Community College Assn.	Governor/Legislature/SBE
13.	MEA/MFT/AAUP	Governor/Legislature/SBE
14.	Local Boards of Trustees - President	Governor/Legislature/SBE

Phase IV: Policy Decision Making

1. Legislature
2. Local Boards of Trustees (Systemwide disaggregated)
3. U.S. Dept. of HEW (through SBE)
4. Judicial System

Involvement Patterns in Michigan Governance (Continued)

Phase V: Policy Implementation

1. Governor (Executive Branch of Government)
2. State Board of Education (Department of Education)
3. Municipal Finance Commission
4. State Teacher's Retirement Board
5. State Tax Commission
6. Michigan Employment Security Commission
7. Michigan Employment Relations Commission
8. Joint Administrative Rules Committee
9. Local Boards of Trustees - President

Phase VI: Policy Review

1. Governor
2. Legislature - Legislative Committees
3. Department of Management & Budget
4. Legislative Fiscal Agencies
5. Auditor General
6. State Board of Education
7. Department of Education
8. State Board for Public Jr. & Community Colleges
9. SBE Advisory Councils
10. Licensure & Regulation Boards
11. Michigan Community College Association
12. MEA/MFT/AAUP
13. State Retirement Board
14. Higher Education Assistance Authority
15. Labor Organizations UAW/AFL/CIO/etc.
16. Local Boards of Trustees - President
17. News Media
18. Student Organizations
19. Community Organizations
20. Business - Industry - Agriculture
21. Professional Organizations
22. K-12 Districts
23. Baccalaureate Institutions (Public & Private)
24. Ad Hoc Commissions

State-Local Governance Roles in Michigan

Very few states have governance models which are either completely centralized or totally autonomous.

It appears that most state systems fall somewhere along a continuum between the two extremes. Michigan leans more towards the autonomous end of this continuum. However, its precise location is difficult to determine.

A review of constitutional and statutory law suggests the following division of governance responsibility at the State and local levels with regard to Michigan community colleges.

THE STATE:

A. DEFINES
   - Basic mission of community colleges
   - Basic organizational options for accomplishing the mission
   - Revenue sources which may be used, and the limits of that usage

B. DETERMINES
   - Services which the State will invest in
   - Level of the State investment
   - Methods for allocating the State investment

C. ALLOCATES
   - The State investment

D. MONITORS
   - The State investment
   - Degree to which basic mission is accomplished
   - Implementation of the law

It should be noted that the State role in our federal system of government is limited to some extent by the federal Constitution, laws, and judicial decisions. In defining the role of the State as it pertains to higher education, Michigan is unique in the autonomy given to public institutions of higher education through its Constitution.

State-Local Governance Roles in Michigan (Continued)

THE LOCAL DISTRICT:

A. DEFINES

- Specific policies for accomplishing the mission
- Organizational plan for accomplishing the mission

B. DETERMINES

- Amount of Local revenues generated
- Services to be rendered

C. CONTROLS

- Expenditure of funds for accomplishing mission
- Management and delivery of services

D. ACCOUNTABLE FOR

- Adequacy of services rendered
- Balancing revenue and expenditures
- Compliance with the law

The locally elected trustees of Michigan Community Colleges are the local autonomy in the Michigan Community College system. The high regard for Michigan Community Colleges across the United States is an indicator that the system works well.

The local boards of trustees direct the colleges through administrators of their choice. While one might argue for more expertise for some individual trustees, a counter argument can be presented that the trustees employ administrators who are supposed to have the expertise needed to advise the trustees and to direct the activities in the manner necessary to achieve the objectives of the college as established by the trustees.

With the election of trustees sponsored by special interest groups, the potential for conflict of interest or diversion of institutional resources for special interest purposes adds a new threat. Any special-interest point of view that subordinates the interest of the general public will erode the ability of the trustees to establish policy consistent with overall community goals and best interests.

The purpose here is to reiterate that the trustees are the local control, and as special interests are able to influence specific trustees, the quality of local control may be in jeopardy.

Centralized Versus Autonomous Systems of Governance

The concept, governance, ultimately resolves itself to basic questions regarding who does what in the policy decision making process.

There are many players in the governance game. With few exceptions these players owe their allegance to one of two super sets--the State and the local community college.

The major difference between a centralized state governance system and a local autonomous system is the focal point of policy decision making. In a centralized system decisions are made in the capital city. In an autonomous system they are made back home in the district.

These decisions involve (1) assessing the public demand for community college services, (2) determining what services will be provided, (3) controlling the methods by which these services will be delivered, (4) providing the funds necessary to enable service, and (5) accounting for the performance of those responsible for the service.

No empirical data is available to prove that one type of system is inherently better than the other. However, based upon a review of literature, there does seem to be certain distinguishable differences in terms of outcomes. (See Appendix III) The outcome differences are submitted in the form of hypotheses since limited statistical data exists to establish them as fact.

Hypothesis 1: Cost Efficiency.

There is no correlation between the overall cost efficiency of a system and the type of governance system, centralized or autonomous. There may be greater variance among institutions with an autonomous structure, in terms of cost efficiency.

Hypothesis 2: Equal Access Opportunity.

Greater availability of specialized programs, assumed in an autonomous system, may not be related to equal access across the system.

Hypothesis 3: Financial Stability.

Financial stability of statewide systems (centralized versus autonomous) does not appear to depend on the type of system. The level of support for individual institutions within a system will vary to a greater degree in autonomous systems. The availability of local funding as an additional source of support provides a greater flexibility of income to the local college.

Hypothesis 4: Information Analysis.

In a centralized system the volume and scope of detailed management information is greater than in an autonomous system. Information analysis in an autonomous system would be more limited to a local analysis of need and demand. Information analysis in a centralized system would tend to give lower priority to local information needs, with preference to state needs.

Hypothesis 5: Overhead Cost.

There is no proven correlation between quality of programs and the higher costs of central administration at the state level in a centralized system. Some specific functions may be made more efficient by centralized operations.

Hypothesis 6: Program Duplication.

Some program duplication may be desirable to enhance student access, but excessive and unnecessary duplication can occur with any type of governance system.

Centralized Versus Autonomous
Systems of Governance (Continued)

Hypothesis 7: Responsiveness to Local Demand.

Because fewer levels of approval are involved, autonomous systems can respond more quickly to local demands. Responses to state level needs are better made through a more centralized system.

Conclusion

Our frustration when facing extremely complex problems that center on making decisions among high priority, highly valued areas, leads us many times to overlook what we have accomplished and what has worked efficiently within the processes and the structures we have maintained.

This is the situation today as we look at the postsecondary educational area in Michigan. The concern is how do we work together when it appears our needs are greater and our resources are fewer, analyzing our strengths and areas of concern.

All across our Country and, in fact, across the world, people are confronted with some of these same difficult questions. Russia, France, and other countries with highly developed centralized planning for higher education are apparently facing the same severe problems of over-productivity of graduates in some areas, scarcity in others, and the inability to react quickly to the problems of their rapidly changing society.

Across the United States we have seen different examples of state-wide planning and coordination and governance. In Michigan, greater autonomy is allocated to local institutions with the result being that Michigan's system of higher education appears to have developed a number of institutions of high quality at all levels, with a minimum amount of duplication and with efficient utilization of resources. The frustration is still here in Michigan, however and some would say that by developing a highly centralized system or an overall governing Board we could save time and human and financial resources. Apparently this has not been the case across the world nor in the United States where this approach has been used.

Michigan is unique in the United States in that it has given Constitutional autonomy to its public colleges and universities. The acceptance of the responsibility of this role by higher education in Michigan has not always been perfect but in comparison with other states of the union, regardless of their structure for coordination, Michigan ranks high in quality of programs, efficiency of operation and acceptance of responsibility.

The tension and conflict that center around the need for coordination and planning goes back to the very beginning of higher education. Lay boards were a part of the early Greek institutions of higher learning and experienced some of the difficulties we have today. The University of Florence (1321) initially was controlled by students who paid the Professors, and I would assume out of kindness and the interest of the City, a Lay Board was appointed and a tax spread to allow for the instructors to be paid other than directly from students in their classroom. In this case, the students lost autonomy and the citizens of the City gained authority. This give and take of lay involvement in higher education and the conflict and tension inherent in cooperation between the needs of society and its representatives can be traced through the early years of higher education in Switzerland, Ireland, the Netherlands, England and our own Colonial history.

In Michigan we have tried several approaches. Initially, the University of Michigan had a Board of Regents appointed by the Governor. The Governor's appointees became too politically involved in the operation and direction of the University of Michigan. Because of this type of involvement, the appointed Board was changed to an elected Board at the next Constitutional Convention. By this Constitutional change and later court decisions these individuals elected by the people and representing their interest were considered co-equal with other elected representatives of the people such as the Governor and the Legislators.

Conclusion (Continued)

This gave Michigan institutions of higher education the opportunity to evolve institutional autonomy and responsibility which was not available to most other states of the Union.

Throughout the history of higher education, politics, student unrest, and faculty desires for autonomy or control have been a part of the scene.

In the early 1900's, the role of the administration and President evolved and this too had a major impact on education throughout the United States. The newest actors to the scene of education are the sophisticated and well trained technicians, available to the Legislators, Governors and State Boards. Along with the development of a technology for information retrieval, these new decision makers evolved. They are part of the growing bureaucracy of the federal, state and local governments. They are highly educated and well trained. These staffs and their input to the Executive Office, Legislative bodies and Boards of the State in fact have changed the power structure of decision making across the United States.

As Michigan community colleges meet the charge of the Legislature regarding their feelings toward State and local governance, it should be important to note, from reviewing what has been presented above, that we stand on a great tradition in our State that has respected the opportunity for local citizen involvement and the chance for individuals and institutions to accept responsibilities and be accountable directly for their actions. It would seem then that we should consider very carefully our past successes and that we use a volunteer-coordination approach for Michigan community colleges based upon input from the Governor's office, the Legislature, institutions of higher education, State agencies, and the State Board of Education.

Conclusion (Continued)

From discussions of the two candidates for President in our recent election, the Country is apparently sensitive to the heavy hand of bureaucracy and individual unaccountability.

It is time to use this new resource of information retrieval, highly sophisticated technicians, Legislators, Governor, State Boards, individual colleges, and other Boards to meld into a new joint co-operative effort to look at the problems of postsecondary education. The engine that could drive and fuel this system could be the request of either the Governor or the Legislature to call for key individuals representative of these groups to sit down and look at the questions that are before the State in postsecondary education. To be sure this approach would appear cumbersome and people would say it probably will not work because we need a strong and centralized authority to force everyone to cooperate and give up part of their autonomy. Apparently that approach has not worked where it has been used. It is time to implement a truly more democratic system that respects the autonomy of the local citizen as expressed through his Board of control in concert with representatives of the total other agencies of the State.

APPENDIX E

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Postsecondary Education means an organized learning opportunity enrolling persons who have completed or terminated their secondary education or who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance.

Liberal Arts and General Education means organized instruction primarily designed for personal and intellectual growth and development, or for preparation for an associate degree or for transfer to a baccalaureate institution.

Occupational Education means organized instruction designed to provide the skills, related instruction and general education necessary for employment.

Continuing Education means organized instruction which may be separately managed and/or uniquely structured to meet the specific needs of the students and/or community.

Community Services means community college activities other than organized instruction which are designed to respond to identified community needs, and which may provide for coordination with other community agencies and services. Moreover, such activities are designed to contribute to and promote cultural, intellectual, and social life as defined by the community.

Area Vocational Education Program means a program of organized systematic instruction designed to prepare the following individuals for useful employment:

(a) Persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market.

(b) Persons who have already entered the labor market and who need training to achieve stability or advancement in employment.

(c) Persons enrolled in high school.

Area in the phrase "area vocational education program," refers to the geographical territory of the district, and whatever territory without the district as is designated for secondary education as the service area of the district by the State Board of Education.

SURVEY RESEARCH — CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the following seven items as they pertain to you and your institution.

1. **POSITION and/or TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE**

   Faculty _____ Administration _____ Board of Control _____

2. **NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION AS**

   Board Member_____ Faculty_____ Administrator_____

3. **NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN YOUR INSTITUTION AS**

   Board Member_____ Faculty_____ Administrator_____

4. **AGE**

   Under 30 _____ 50 to 59 _____ 60 and over _____

   30 to 49 _____

5. **TYPE OF INSTITUTION (Check your type of institution)**

   A. **Two-year Institutions**

   (1) Community College Public_____ Private_____ (3) Private Business Junior College _____

   (2) Private Liberal Arts Junior College _____ (4) Other (Specify) _____

   B. **Four to Five Year Institutions**

   (1) Private Liberal Arts College _____ (4) Private Bible College or Institute _____

   (2) Private Business College _____ (5) Public College _____

   (3) Private Technical Institute _____ (6) Other (Specify) _____

   C. **Professional Graduate Schools and Universities**

   (1) Private Law School _____ (3) Public University _____

   (2) Private University _____ (4) Other (Specify) _____

6. **SIZE OF INSTITUTION**

   Full-time Equated (FTE) enrollment for Fiscal Year 1975-76. Do not show calendar year 1975.

   Under 500 _____ 2,500-3,499 _____ 15,000-19,999 _____

   500-999 _____ 3,500-4,999 _____ 20,000-24,999 _____

   1,000-1,499 _____ 5,000-9,999 _____ 25,000-29,999 _____

   1,500-2,499 _____ 10,000-14,999 _____ 30,000-over _____

7. **ARE ANY OF YOUR INSTITUTION'S EMPLOYEES ORGANIZED FOR FORMAL BARGAINING PURPOSES?**

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, indicate the areas organized:

   Custodial/Maintenance _____ Para-Professional _____ Administration _____

   Clerical/Secretarial _____ Faculty _____

PART I

For each of the following statements please indicate your opinion by placing a check mark in the appropriate area to the right. Your response will be treated confidentially.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
1. Do you feel that the following definition developed by the Governor's Commission on Higher Education is appropriate for post-secondary education? "Post-secondary education is any instruction, research, public service or other learning opportunity offered to persons who have completed their secondary education or who are beyond the compulsory sacondary school attendance age (age 16) and who are participating in an organized educational program or learning experience administered by other than schools whose primary role is elementary and secondary education."						
2. Most Michigan higher education institutions are preparing students effectively for the job market.						
3. The present approach for planning and coordination for higher education in Michigan will meet the needs of the future.						
4. Consideration of statewide planning and coordination for Michigan higher education are separable from concerns of institutional governance.						
5. The goals and purposes of post-secondary education in Michigan are clearly defined.						
6. For Michigan, the *voluntary* approach for governance and coordination for higher education is appropriate.						
7. For Michigan, the *advisory* approach for governance and coordination for higher education is appropriate.						
8. For Michigan, a *regulatory* approach for governance and coordination for higher education is appropriate.						
9. One of the strengths of higher education in Michigan is the relative independence of the boards of control.						
10. Present boards of control for public colleges and universities should be discontinued and these colleges and universities placed under the direction of a single statewide board.						
11. Not having a statewide board of control will lead to duplication of resources, unwarranted competition and lack of inner institutional cooperation.						
12. Board members in higher education should be elected on a non-partisan ballot.						
13. Board members in higher education should be elected on a partisan ballot.						
14. Board members in higher education should be appointed by the Governor with advice and consent of the Senate.						
15. Faculty members should be allowed to serve on their own institution's board of control.						
16. Students should be allowed to serve on their own institution's board of control.						
17. Faculty members should be allowed to serve on boards of control of institutions of higher education other than their own.						
18. Administrators and staff members should be allowed to serve on boards of control of institutions of higher education other than their own.						
19. Students should be allowed to serve on boards of control of institutions of higher education other than their own.						
20. Community college boards of control should continue to be elected.						
21. Community college boards of control should be appointed by the Governor with advice and consent of the Senate.						
22. Redistricting of Michigan community colleges should take place to provide the services of these institutions equally to all areas of the State.						
23. Community colleges should not be allowed to grant baccalaureate degrees.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
24. Community colleges should have the same relationship to the proposed State Board of Higher Education as baccalaureate institutions.						
25. Separate Boards of Trustees should be established for those community colleges presently under K-12 boards.						
26. The functions and responsibilities of the present State Board of Education should be limited constitutionally to leadership, general supervision, planning and coordination for elementary and secondary education only.						
27. There is substantial support in the *educational* community for creation of a separate State Board of Higher Education with *advisory* powers.						
28. There is a substantial *legislative* support for creation of a separate State Board of Higher Education with *advisory* powers.						
29. There is substantial support in the *Executive Office* for creation of a separate State Board of Higher Education with *advisory* powers.						
30. Coordination and planning for higher education should be brought about by Constitutional change.						
31. Coordination and planning for higher education should be brought about by statutory enactment.						
32. The 1963 Michigan Constitution is ambiguous regarding the authority of the State Board of Education and the Boards of public baccalaureate institutions regarding planning and coordination.						
33. There should be a Constitutional revision to allow for establishment of a new State Board for Higher Education if its responsibilities are limited to general planning and coordination of all education beyond the secondary level, *with advisory and recommendatory, rather than mandatory, authority.*						
34. There should be a Constitutional revision and vote of the people to allow for establishment of a new State Board for Higher Education with *mandatory* authority for general planning and coordination.						

PART II

What is your opinion concerning the following seven statements if a new State Board of Higher Education were established?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
1. Members of this proposed Board should be appointed by the Governor, with advice and consent of the Senate.						
2. Members of this proposed Board should be elected at large.						
3. Membership of this proposed Board should be limited to no less than seven and no more than fifteen.						
4. The chief executive officer of the proposed State Board for Higher Education should be elected.						
5. The chief executive officer of the proposed State Board for Higher Education should be appointed.						
6. The functions of this proposed Board should be reviewed every five to eight years.						
7. Statutory basis should provide for involving the State's independent colleges and universities and the private trade, technical and business schools in the overall planning and coordination process of this proposed Board.						

PART III

In your opinion, if a new State Board of Higher Education is established, should the following responsibilities be a part of its duties?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
1. It should collect essential information and data about post-secondary education in Michigan.						
2. It should conduct comprehensive and continuous planning and assessment studies of all aspects of post-secondary education.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
3. It should advise the Governor and the Legislature as to the financial and other needs of post-secondary education.						
4. It should advise the Governor and the Legislature on the roles and missions of individual institutions, their educational programs, and needs for new programs, centers, schools or departments.						
5. It should provide assistance in the development of cooperative relationships among institutions and among the sectors of post-secondary education.						
6. It should name appropriate advisory committees and councils.						
7. It should provide, from time to time, such other advice and counsel concerning higher education as either the Governor or the Legislature may require.						

PART IV

What is your opinion about the following thirteen statements regarding the future conditions of post-secondary education?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Lack Information
1. Stabilized enrollment.						
2. Decreasing enrollment.						
3. Increasing enrollment.						
4. Increasing cost.						
5. More specialized demands for educational services.						
6. Competition for students.						
7. Competition for revenue.						
8. Institutional missions more difficult to define.						
9. Maintenance of quality more difficult to sustain.						
10. Cooperative effort among institutions of higher education more difficult.						
11. Resources more difficult to manage.						
12. Greater diversity of programs of higher education.						
13. Increased respect for higher education by the public.						

COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

82

APPENDIX G

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Terry L. Meeder
Superintendent

BAY DE NOC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Edwin E. Wuehle
President

C.S. MOTT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Charles N. Pappas
President

DELTA COLLEGE

Mr. Donald J. Carlyon
President

GLEN OAKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Philip G. Ward
President

GOGEBIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. R. Ernest Dear
President

GRAND RAPIDS JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. Richard W. Calkins
President

HENRY FORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Stuart M. Bundy
President

HIGHLAND PARK COLLEGE

Dr. Thomas Lloyd
President

JACKSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Harold V. Sheffer
President

KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Dale B. Lake
President

KELLOGG COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Richard F. Whitmore
President

KIRTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Robert A. Stenger
President

LAKE MICHIGAN COLLEGE

Dr. James L. Lehman
President

LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Philip J. Gannon
President

MACOMB COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Robert F. Roelofs
President

MID MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Eugene W. Gillaspy
President

MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Ronald Campbell
President

MONTCALM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Clifford J. Bedore
President

MUSKEGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Robert H. Keessen
Interim President

NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE

Mr. Alfred D. Shankland
President

NORTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE

Dr. William J. Yankee
President

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Joseph E. Hill
President

ST. CLAIR COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Richard L. Norris
President

STATE BOARD FOR PUBLIC COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Mr. Charles Boyer
Ms. Shirley Collier
Mr. Carmen DelliQuadri
Mr. Norman Mackay
Dr. John McLean, Jr.
Dr. Alfred Meyers
Dr. Peter Oppewall

SCHOOLCRAFT COLLEGE

Dr. C. Nelson Grote
President

SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE

Dr. Russell "M" Owen
President

WASHTENAW COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Gunder A. Myran
President

WAYNE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Reginald Wilson
President

WEST SHORE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. John M. Eaton
President

STAFF PERSONNEL

House Fiscal Agency

Mr. Ron Root
Mr. Vincent Carillot

Senate Fiscal Agency

Mr. John McComb
Dr. David Murphy

Office of the Budget

Mr. Pat Keating
Ms. Louise Tama
Dr. Fred Whims

Department of Education

Dr. Robert Huxol
Dr. Jane Moehle
Dr. James Weber

SB1346 SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

MISSION AND ROLES SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairperson: President Russell Owen, Southwestern Michigan College

Alpena Community College
C. S. Mott Community College
Delta College
Henry Ford Community College
Highland Park Community College
Kirtland Community College
Macomb County Community College
Monroe Community College
St. Clair County Community Coll.
Southwestern Michigan College
North Central Michigan College
Wayne County Community College

*Ms. Shirley Collier

FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairperson: President Harold Sheffer, Jackson Community College

Bay De Noc Community College
Glen Oaks Community College
Gogebic Community College
Grand Rapids Junior College
Jackson Community College
Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Kellogg Community College
Macomb Community College
Mid-Michigan Community College
Muskegon Community College
Northwestern Michigan College
Oakland Community College
Wayne County Community College

*Mr. DelliQuadri, Mr. McKay, Dr. Meyers

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTE

Chairperson: President Philip Gannon, Lansing Community College

Delta College
Glen Oaks Community College
Grand Rapids Junior College
Lake Michigan College
Lansing Community College
Macomb County Community College
Montcalm Community College
Muskegon Community College
Northwestern Michigan College
Schoolcraft College
Washtenaw Community College
West Shore Community College

*Mr. Boyer, Dr. Oppewall

* Member of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges

STATE BOARD FOR
PUBLIC COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Dr. John A. McLean, Jr.
Chairperson
Detroit

Dr. Alfred Meyers
Vice-Chairperson
West Bloomfield

Carmen DeliiQuadri
Secretary
Houghton

Mrs. Donald Bacon
Ann Arbor

Charles A. Boyer
Manistee

Shirley A. Collier
Grand Rapids

Norman G. Mackay
Livonia

Dr. Peter Oppewall
Grand Rapids

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Dr. John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 25 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW

The Michigan State Board of Education hereby agrees that it will comply with Federal laws prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to regulations of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Therefore, it shall be the policy of the Michigan State Board of Education that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, or marital status shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any federally funded program or activity for which the Michigan State Board of Education is responsible or for which it receives federal financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This policy of nondiscrimination shall also apply to otherwise qualified handicapped individuals.